

DNCT/EWA
Draft Meeting Minutes
8/24/99
9:00-12:00

Attendees:

Mike Fris, Jim Snow, Jim White, Dale Flowers, Bruce Herbold, Dave Fullerton, BJ Miller, Tom Cannon, Pete Chadwick, Paul Fujitani, Art Hinojosa, Dave Fullerton, George Barnes, John Leahigh, Guy Master

Agenda:

- 1) Asset Paper
- 2) EWA Uses Paper
- 3) Water Supply Delivery Matrix
- 4) Biology Data for 15 Year Games
- 5) Games
- 6) Model differences

SUMMARY OF KEY POINTS OF AGREEMENT

ASSETS

1. Divide assets into three categories: early stage 1, late stage 1, and post stage 1.
2. Agreed that we need to develop cost information on each asset.
3. Agreed that we need to advise EWADT on how to coordinate B(2), ERP, and EWA.
4. Identified a need for EWADT to coordinate with the following:
 - SWP and CVP Operations
 - CVPIA Water Management Program/Strategy
 - ESA (opinions and take; Conservation Strategy)
 - ERP Water Acquisitions and Habitat Program
 - COA
5. We should list how each asset could be used for water supply or EWA.

6. Need to identify the range of usefulness of each asset.
7. Dave will prepare update of paper.

USES

1. Prepare Table Matrix of EWA Uses for next meeting.

DEMAND/DELIVERIES

2. Paul is looking into changing CVP demands/deliveries in wet and dry years.
3. Need to work with water users to define their needs - range of needs - delivery options that would satisfy their needs.
4. Paul and George will lead subteam to see if changes are necessary in demand/deliveries.

GAMING

5. Prepare paper on ways for making gaming more efficient. Also identify needed technical work before we further game.
6. Ron should not present gaming paper next week.
7. Need to show how gaming will address specific questions we have about assets and uses.

GEORGIANNA SLOUGH DEFT CHALLENGE (Dick Daniel)

Dick Daniel stopped by to discuss how to respond to a DEFT recommendation to restore habitat along Georgianna Slough. CALFED has defined GS habitat restoration as a recommended action in Stage 1a in the North Delta.

Dick would like DEFT to consider the question of habitat in the North Delta and come up with an experimental design to evaluate the benefit of habitat restoration in the North Delta - including potential benefits to salmon smolt survival, the number of miles or acres needed, criteria for evaluation, and how to test hypotheses (e.g., via a CWT study?).

ASSET PAPER (Dave Fullerton)

Dave summarized his draft paper.

- Is expanded Banks realistic in Stage 1? Would require screens and SD program.

C: There is substantial opposition to Expanded Banks in the environmental community.

- JPOD - concerns about distribution of benefits
- GW Program - what kind of a program can be developed in Stage 1.
- B(2) program - Include in EWA? Use these resources for EWA purposes?

C: B(2) is not an asset for EWA to use - legal constraints - B(2) should be "essential compliment" to EWA. EWA should be coordinated with other water accounts.

S: Suggest two groups: physical and operational assets. Also money group and other group (for things like options).

S: We should assign people to each asset.

C: JPOD is not a physical asset - its operational or other.

C: Need a group called "Institutional options".

C: Concerned that we identify In-Delta Storage but not SOD storage (e.g., Los Vacaros could perform the same function as a Bacon Island storage).

S: We should not cut off our asset list with the end of Stage 1.

C: We should consider the targets of CALFED's Water Use Efficiency Group. Tie together with EWA.

C: Breaking out assets into categories may cause some problems.

C: EWA needs to slowly build a track record to succeed. Changing water quality standards may be too ambitious early in process. We shouldn't push EWA too far too early.

R: EWADT will be better served by giving them a realistic list of optional assets that we think may be needed to recovery species.

C: We should coordinate with the CALFED storage group.

C: We should expand the EWA water market to the whole water market question.

C: We should consider who pays. R: other forums responsible.

C: Other info on cost and feasibility should be developed by group for evaluation. R: Yes, people should see cost information on each option.

C: EWA, ERP, and CVPIA should be coordinated if not integrated. R: Need to give EWADT something about this.

Q: Are we considering more stringent criteria? R: We are looking at the two Services proposal as potential for more stringent criteria if EWA fails in its purpose.

C: We ought to include the B(2) decision as part of the picture.

C: EWADT should assign people to coordinate with other water management activities - define conflicts, overlaps, opportunities for cooperation.

C: CALFED Conservation Strategy is awaiting coordination with EWA.

C: We need to understand the mechanics of each asset.

C: We may be moving too fast for Small Group. They don't like us including things that are negotiable. We as staff need not force them on contentious issues. We should give them things that are easier to deal with. Give them options. Separate the easy and hard issues.

C: We need to lay out the whole process with them.

C: Everything is contentious.

C: The DNCT is just one part of the process. We need to get our and their process organized.

C: We should be trying to make ourselves useful. We should predict information needs. This is the purpose of our papers.

C: We need to find means to communicate what we know to the EWADT.

S: Need to nail down realism in each asset + info on each.

C: A range of usefulness should be developed for each asset.

Q: Should we define our role? R: No. Too many options - we could outline potential role.

Q: Are we narrowing the issues for Policy? R: Yes, we predigest the problem from insights from what we have learned.

S: We should upgrade Dave's paper as much as possible.

S: New Asset: MWD's storage and water in East Side Reservoir could be an asset on list. Could also consider other non-project storage. This is related to our potential for demand shifting.

USES PAPER (Mike Fris)

- Identify actions we used in gaming for each species.

example: Delta smelt adults

Action: export reductions in winter (triggers, goals, science) -

Assets Used: SOD storage, purchases, etc.

Frequency: >50%, most years, one month reduction

Overlap with: salmon protections

Baseline:

S: Prepare table matrix for next meeting.

C: Define level of change target. What we will be able to accomplish.

S: Need something on hypotheses testing.

S: Need for protection - importance

C: What was historical case + what we expect to buy with assets.

WATER SUPPLY DEMAND MATRIX (George Barnes)

- Looked at DWRSIM demand/deliveries - seemed reasonable
- CVP changes depend on knowing deficiencies.
- Paul is looking into adjusting wet and dry year demands for CVP
- Reviewed MWD demands - seem reasonable
- Looked at how often we satisfy demands in study - and how much additional water is needed to satisfy demands. CVP appears to need an additional 200 TAF; about the same for SWP.
- 15-Year game would use a revised demand pattern.

Q: In what context do you use the word "demand"? R: Current level of demand. Demands will change with East Side Reservoir. Demands will increase during Stage 1. Costs will increase for the late increments of demand.

Q: How will MWD exercise their entitlement with East Side Reservoir? R: Every year they will take a little more water.

C: We need to have realistic demands. R: We have had no response from the BOR.

S: Need the demand profile for each year. R: CVP demands vary by year and allocation. Our system simulation models do well to account for water. Historic patterns are ok in extreme years but not for moderate years - different allocation and deliveries now. We are moving storage water differently now, so even extremes are different. Deliveries will be different in most years. We could make adjustments in demand if we knew how.

Q: How have changes in allocation affected deliveries? R: Model predicted effect of allocation changes.

Q: Are future water conservation measures incorporated into DWRSIM? No.

Q: How do you handle new delivery needs? R: Demand patterns are predicted in fall. Use forecasts in gaming. R: forecast system was used in gaming. This year's forecast overestimated deliveries because of cool summer.

C: We need to identify realistic deliveries especially in wet years when EWA assets are heavily drawn down.

S: Need to work with water users to define their needs.

C: We can't make game close to historic conditions - future will be different.

Q: Can we define rules that define deliveries under different conditions?

C: Concerned about delivery biases that affect EWA effectiveness.

C: Problems with monthly models accurately predicting deliveries in response to demands, let alone problems with accurate demands.

BIOLOGICAL DATA

C: Topic for next meeting

Q: Can we use biological data to predict future under different conditions. R: We may be able to develop a model using available data.

GAMING

- Small Group - concerned about gaming
- Gaming provides valuable inputs to decisions.
- Gaming must be relevant to our needs.

C: Small Group is worried about gaming effort. Concerned about DNCT making policy decisions - possible wasted effort - have yet to be vetted.

C: Need to communicate that we are only getting ready to effectively game, but have yet to initiate. We will focus on Small Group needs.

C: We are designing for efficient gaming.

Q: Is there something other than gaming that will answer questions?

C: We need decisions from Small Group before we can game - we need to know assets and baseline.

S: We should try different baselines, assets, etc. and compare to baseline established.

S: We should vary elements.

S: We should go at gaming from subteam approach - using 15 year will improve gaming.

S: We should outline pre and post processing actions that will expedite gaming.

C: We need only a couple of tough games from which to compare some small changes for additional input.

C: Focus our attention on key points and wait for input from Small Group. We are their staff.

C: Need to define tools for evaluating assets - have we invested in gaming to understand asset? R: We can use further games to touch up our understanding of assets. We can point out simple means for evaluating assets using gaming.

C: Need to talk more about who decides on how to use assets - governance issue.